

### **REMARKS**

Claims 7 and 15-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitcher et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,144,552) in view of Karasaki (JP 11-167108). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of independent claim 7 because the cited references fail to disclose or suggest an electrically insulating bezel.

Page 2 of the Office Action identifies the front housing 15 of Whitcher as equivalent to the electrically insulating bezel of the present invention. The front housing 15 and a rear housing 17 of Whitcher define a generally rectangular housing 13 which is constructed out of a rigid and durable material such as plastic (Col. 3, Ins. 43-49 and FIGs. 1 and 3). However, as is known to those skilled in the art, plastic is not necessarily electrically insulating. That is, there are various kinds of electrically conductive resin known to those skilled in the art of computer housing design. Therefore, Applicants believe that Whitcher fails to disclose or suggest the electrically insulating bezel of the present invention. Since Karasaki is also silent regarding this feature, withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claims 7 and 15-16 is respectfully requested.

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitcher in view of Howell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,353,531). Applicants traverse the rejection for the reasons recited above with respect to the rejection of independent claims 7 and 16.

Howell is merely cited in the Office Action as disclosing in FIGs. 2 and 4 an electronic apparatus comprising a housing 32 and a display panel module 36 incorporated within the housing. Howell fails to disclose the present electrically insulating bezel. Therefore, since each of the references individually fail to disclose or suggest an electrically insulating bezel, the combination of the references also fails to disclose or suggest this feature. For this reason, withdrawal of the §103 rejection of independent claim 17 is respectfully requested.

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whitcher in view of Karasaki, and further in view of either Mishima et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0033265) or Yamamoto (U.S. Patent No. 5,993,027). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for the reasons recited above with respect to the rejection of independent claim 17.

Since claim 18 depends upon claim 17, it necessarily includes all of the features of its associated independent claim plus other additional features. Thus, Applicants submit that the §103 rejection of claim 18 has also been overcome for the same reasons mentioned above to overcome the rejection of independent claim 17, and also because the Mishima and Yamamoto references fail to overcome the deficiencies of the Whitcher reference. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claim 18 also be withdrawn.


New claims 19-21 are added for consideration. Claim 19 depends from claim 7 and further defines the electrically insulating bezel as receiving the set of the display panel and the panel-shaped module component without having an electrically-conductor frame in front of the display panel. New claims 20-21 also recite this feature, and depend from claims 16 and 17, respectfully. Applicants earnestly solicit allowance of new claims 19-21 for the features they recite and also because of the reasons recited above.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that this Application is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By



Joseph P. Fox

Registration No. 41,760

September 7, 2005

300 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 2500  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Telephone: (312) 360-0080  
Facsimile: (312) 360-9315  
Customer No. 24978

P:\DOCS\2500\65689\9H2829.DOC